

Remarks/Arguments

Summary

By this Amendment, claims 1, 7 and 12 have been amended, and claims 3-6 and 8-9 have been canceled.

Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 7 and 10-20 remain pending in the application, with claims 13-20 being withdrawn from consideration as directed to a non-elected invention.

35 USC 103

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. (US 5607718) in view of Miyashita et al. (US 6354913).

By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of canceled claim 5. As such, the polishing slurry of the claimed invention includes an abrasive, deionized water, a pH controlling agent, choline chloride, and polyethylene imine. The invention is at least partially characterized by the synergy achieved from the combination of PEI and choline chloride in reducing the removal rates of the silicon oxide and silicon nitride layers. Applicants respectfully contend that amended claim 1, and the claims 2, 7 and 10-12 dependent thereon, define over the Sasaki et al. and Miyashita et al. references.

The slurry of claim 1 includes a pH controlling agent and PEI and a choline chloride. As noted in Applicants previous response, the references simply teach that PEI may be used to control pH and that a choline may be used to control pH. The Examiner has not explained what might motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to use both PEI and choline chloride to control pH in a slurry which already includes a pH controller. In fact, Applicants respectfully contend that one of ordinary skill would

not be motivated to combine both PEI and choline chloride into a slurry which already includes a pH controller.

Further, the amended claim 1 recites the inclusion of choline chloride in the slurry. As explained in the present specification, the inclusion of choline chloride is particularly preferred (para. 0205). Applicants can find no teachings in the reference choline chloride.

Again, the invention is at least partially characterized by the synergetic effect achieved from adding both PEI and choline chloride to the slurry (which already includes a pH controller) to thereby reduce the removal rates of the silicon oxide and silicon nitride layers. The cited references, taken individually or in combination, to not teach or suggest the combination which comprises the slurry of the present claims.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Sasaki et al. in view of Miyashita et al. and Kimura (US 5869392). Applicants request reconsideration of this rejection for at least the same reasons stated above in connection with claims 1-12.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully contend that claim 12 is not rendered obvious by the teachings of Sasaki et al., Miyashita et al. and Kimura, taken individually or in combination.

Conclusion

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon the elected claims 1-12 now present in the application are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE FRANCOS, PLLC

By:



Adam C. Volentine
Reg. No. 33,289

October 29, 2003

VOLENTINE FRANCOS, PLLC
12200 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 150
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 715-0870